

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/087,446	03/01/2002	Walter S. Conard	5384/55090	6679
7590 06/18/2004 KEITH E. GEORGE, ESQ. MC DERMOTT, WILL & EMERY 600 13TH STREET, N.W.			EXAMINER	
			GIBSON, RANDY W	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	N, DC 20005-3096		2841	
			DATE MAILED: 06/18/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Applicat	ion No.	Applicant(s)					
Office Action Summary		10/087,4	146	CONARD ET AL.	ίK				
		Examin	r	Art Unit					
		Randy W	. Gibson	2841					
Th MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover she t with the correspondence address Period for Reply									
A SH THE   - Exter after - If the - If NO - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOMAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNI asions of time may be available under the provisions SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this comm period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30 period for reply is specified above, the maximum stare to reply within the set or extended period for reply reply received by the Office later than three months a end patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	CATION. of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no enunication. 0) days, a reply within the statutory period will apply and will, by statute, cause the ap.	vent, however, may a atutory minimum of th will expire SIX (6) MC plication to become A	reply be timely filed irty (30) days will be considered timely. NTHS from the mailing date of this commu	nication.				
Status				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
1)	Responsive to communication(s) file	ed on		: -					
2a) <u></u>	This action is <b>FINAL</b> .	2b)⊠ This action is	non-final.						
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.								
Disposit	ion of Claims								
_	4) Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.  4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.								
·	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☑ Claim(s) <u>1-8 and 10</u> is/are rejected.								
7) Claim(s) 9 is/are objected to.									
-	8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.								
Applicat	ion Papers			:					
9)□	The specification is objected to by the	e Examiner.		:					
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>1 March 2002</u> is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objected to by the Examiner.									
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).									
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.									
Priority (	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119								
a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim  All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority  2. Certified copies of the priority  3. Copies of the certified copies application from the Internation  See the attached detailed Office action	documents have be documents have be of the priority documenal Bureau (PCT Ru	en received. en received in nents have bee ule 17.2(a)).	Application No n received in this National Sta	ge				
				:					
2) Notice 3) Infor	et(s) ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (P mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or er No(s)/Mail Date		Paper No	r Summary (PTO-413) o(s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application (PTO-152	2)				

Application/Control Number: 10/087,446 Page 2

Art Unit: 2841

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

#### Information Disclosure Statement

1. The listing of references in the specification is not a proper information disclosure statement. 37 CFR 1.98(b) requires a list of all patents, publications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office, and MPEP § 609 A(1) states, "the list may not be incorporated into the specification but must be submitted in a separate paper." Therefore, unless the references have been cited by the examiner on form PTO-892, they have not been considered.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
- 3. Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 8, and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kinnemann (US # 6,107,579). Kinnemann discloses the claimed invention including a scale transport assembly (TS), a load cell assembly (WS), a channel pathway (Col. 2, lines 43-53), and a means for sensing the presence of the mail

Art Unit: 2841

pieces (IS). The transport assembly does not appear to be attached to the load cell, assembly, so it must be detachably supported.

4. Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 8, and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hübler et al (US # 6,265,675). Hübler et al discloses the claimed invention including a scale transport assembly (4), a load cell assembly (7), and a channel pathway (1,2,61). It appears that the belt 41 can be removed, so the transport assembly is "detachably" supported.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 6. Claims 4 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hübler et al (US # 6,265,675) in view of Lüchinger et al (US # 6,686,545). Hübler et al discloses the claimed invention except they use only one load cell and the front wall is not hinged to provide access.

Regarding the use of more than one load cell, the courts have held that mere duplication of parts has no patentable significance unless a new and unexpected result is produced. See *In re Harza*, 274 F.2d 669, 124 USPQ 378 (CCPA 1960); and, *MPEP* 

middle as disclosed, would have the predictable result that each load cell would

§ 2144.04. In this case, adding a load cell at either end, rather than just one in the

measure half the load, which would have been summed to obtain the total. Having a

load cell at either end would have also had the predictable result of reducing the

bending moments on a centrally located load cell caused by a heavy package just as it

entered or left the scale pan (I.E.: causing the pan to tip one way or the other thus

producing torque on a centrally located support), thus eliminating transient errors and

would have been obvious for that reason.

As for the limitation of having the front wall hinged so as to allow one to remove a

mail piece from the scale, hinged walls are generally known as shown by the example

of Lüchinger et al, and it would have been obvious to make the front wall (2) of Hübler

et all hinged to allow access to the scale pan to service the belt or to allow removal of a

jammed mail piece.

Conclusion

7. Claim 9 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would

be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base

claim and any intervening claims.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Randy W. Gibson whose telephone number is (571)

272-2103. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri., 9-5.

Application/Control Number: 10/087,446

Art Unit: 2841

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David S Martin can be reached on (571) 272-2107. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Randy/W. Gibson Primary Examiner Art Unit 2841 Page 5